



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,701	08/05/2003	Douglas A. Wood	RSW920030050US1	7561

43168 7590 07/28/2008
MARCIA L. DOUBET LAW FIRM
PO BOX 422859
KISSIMMEE, FL 34742

EXAMINER

RADTKE, MARK A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2165

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

07/28/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mld@mindspring.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/634,701	Applicant(s) WOOD, DOUGLAS A.	
	Examiner MARK A. X RADTKE	Art Unit 2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5,7,9-13 and 17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5,7,9-13 and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 29 April 2008 has been entered.

Remarks

2. In response to communications filed on 29 April 2008, claim(s) 2, 4, 6, 8 and 14-16 is/are cancelled and claim(s) 1, 3, 5, 7, 9-10 and 17 is/are amended per Applicant's request. Therefore, claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9-13 and 17 are presently pending in the application, of which, claim(s) 1 and 15-17 is/are presented in independent form.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2165

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3, 5, 9-13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over RDF Syntax ("Resource Description Framework (RDF) Model and Syntax Specification" by W3C, 8 October 1998. Available online at <http://citeseer.ist.psu.edu/article/lassila98resource.html>) in view of Brunet (U.S. Pat. No. 6,654,759, cited previously).

As to claim 1, RDF Syntax teaches a method of uniquely identifying resources (see section 1, "Introduction"), comprising steps of:

modeling the resources using a hierarchical schema, wherein classes in the hierarchical schema correspond to resource types (see section 1, paragraph 5, line 4, "Classes are organized in a hierarchy") and wherein instances in the hierarchical schema represent individual resources, each instance being defined according to a class definition of a selected one of the classes that corresponds to the resource type of the individual resource represented by the instance (see section 2.1, paragraph 1, last sentence, "resources correspond to objects and properties correspond to instance variables");

defining, in the class definition of a topmost class of the hierarchical schema, a naming rule property and an instance identity property (see section 2.2., paragraph 2, "XML rules"), wherein each class at levels of the hierarchical schema beneath the

Art Unit: 2165

topmost class inherits the naming rule property and the instance identity property (see section 1, paragraph 5).

RDF Syntax does not explicitly teach

specifying a value of the naming rule property in each of the class definitions, wherein:

the value of the naming rule property comprises at least one property name selected from a collection of property names comprising the class definition;

for each class definition, the selected at least one property name is selected to ensure that each instance identity generated for the instances defined according to the class definition is unique among all of the instances in the hierarchical schema;

the value of the naming rule property specified in at least one of the class definitions comprises at least two of the property names selected from the collection of property names comprising the class definition; and

the value of the naming rule property for at least two of the class definitions differs; and

for each of the modeled resources, specifying a value of the instance identity property in the instance which represents that resource, wherein:

the value of the instance identity is generated according to the specified value of the naming rule property for the class definition according to which that instance is defined; and

the value of the instance identity specifies a class name of a particular one of the classes that corresponds to the resource type of this resource and, for

each of the at least one property name defined as the value of the naming rule property in the class definition of the particular one of the classes, a name and value pair comprising that property name and a property value corresponding thereto for the resource represented by this instance.

However, Brunet teaches

specifying a value of the naming rule property in each of the class definitions, wherein:

the value of the naming rule property comprises at least one property name selected from a collection of property names comprising the class definition (see col. 7, ll. 35-41);

for each class definition, the selected at least one property name is selected to ensure that each instance identity generated for the instances defined according to the class definition is unique among all of the instances in the hierarchical schema (see col. 7, ll. 30, "uniquely identified");

the value of the naming rule property specified in at least one of the class definitions comprises at least two of the property names selected from the collection of property names comprising the class definition (see col. 7, ll. 41-43); and

the value of the naming rule property for at least two of the class definitions differs (see col. 7, ll. 30, "uniquely"); and

for each of the modeled resources, specifying a value of the instance identity property in the instance which represents that resource (see col. 7, ll. 18-29), wherein:

the value of the instance identity is generated according to the specified value of the naming rule property for the class definition according to which that instance is defined (see col. 7, ll. 30-32); and

the value of the instance identity specifies a class name of a particular one of the classes that corresponds to the resource type of this resource and, for each of the at least one property name defined as the value of the naming rule property in the class definition of the particular one of the classes, a name and value pair comprising that property name and a property value corresponding thereto for the resource represented by this instance (see col. 7, ll. 35-36, "<naming attribute> <value> pair").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time the invention was made to have modified RDF Syntax by the teaching of Brunet for the benefit of automatically and uniquely identifying class instances (see Brunet, col. 7, ll. 30-32).

As to claim 3, RDF Syntax, as modified, teaches further comprising locating a particular instance that represents a particular resource using the value of the instance identity property for that instance (see section 6, Formal Grammar for RDF).

As to claim 5, RDF Syntax, as modified, teaches wherein:

the naming rule property for at least one of the class definitions further comprises a scoping context selected to ensure that each of the instance identities generated for

the instance defined according to the class definition are unique within the scoping context (see Brunet, Abstract); and

the value of the instance identity property for each of the instances defined according to that class definition further comprises the scoping context (see section 2.2.1).

As to claim 7, RDF Syntax, as modified, teaches wherein the scoping context comprises a scoping class name that identifies one of the classes and, for each of the at least one property name specified as the value of the naming rule property in the class definition of the identified one of the classes, a name and value pair comprising that property name and the value corresponding thereto for a particular instance of the identified one of the classes (see Brunet, Abstract).

As to claim 9, RDF Syntax, as modified, teaches wherein:

the naming rule property for at the least one of the class definitions further comprises a root context to ensure that each of the instance identities generated for the instances defined according to the class definition are unique within the scoping context within the root context (see Brunet, col. 7, ll. 50, "ROOT"); and

the value of the instance identity property for each of the instances defined according to that class definition further comprises the root scope (see section 2.2.1, page 2, "namespace").

As to claim 10, RDF Syntax, as modified, teaches wherein the root scope comprises a domain name (see section 2.2.1, page 2, where "domain name" is read on "description.org").

As to claim 11, RDF Syntax, as modified, teaches wherein the value of the naming rule property is specified using a structured document (See section 2.2. XML is a structured document format).

As to claim 12, RDF Syntax, as modified, teaches wherein the value of the naming rule property is specified using a structured markup language (See section 2.2. XML is a structured markup language).

As to claim 13, RDF Syntax, as modified, teaches wherein the hierarchical schema is an object-oriented schema (see section 1, paragraph 5).

As to claim 17, RDF Syntax teaches a method of generating unique resource identities (see section 1), comprising steps of:

For the remaining steps of this claim applicant(s) is/are directed to the remarks and discussions made in claim 1 above.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 29 April 2008 with respect to the rejected claims in view of the cited references have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new grounds for rejection.

Additional References

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of art with respect to naming rules in general:

Doc. No.	Assigned to
US 7284196 B2	Skeen; Marion Dale et al.
US 7131138 B2	Ikeda; Minoru
US 20030018466 A1	Imaura, Takeshi

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to the examiner, Mark A. Radtke. The examiner's telephone number is (571)

Art Unit: 2165

272-7163, and the examiner can normally be reached between 9 AM and 5 PM,
Monday through Friday.

If attempts to contact the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,
Christian Chace, can be reached at (571) 272-4190.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or
proceeding should be directed to Customer Service at (800) 786-9199.

maxr

25 July 2008

/Christian P. Chace/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165